

REMARKS

This Amendment, submitted in response to the Office Action dated May 5, 2004, is believed to be fully responsive to each point of rejection raised therein. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration on the merits is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-4 have been amended to better conform with USPTO practice and procedure. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parodi et al. "Integrating ObjectBroker and DCE Security" in view of Ossher et al. "Combination of Inheritance Hierarchies." Applicant submits the following in traversal of the rejection.

Claim 1

The Examiner cites Parodi for teaching a programming interface including methods adapted to manage said secured call, wherein said methods belong to one only of the following classes "a first class (ISCC) including methods of initiating said secured call, a second class (ASCC) including methods of accepting said secured call, a third class (SECC) including methods for bidirectional exchange of messages via said secured call or the secured closure of said call", as recited in claim 1.

Parodi describes a sequence of operations including 1, 2 and 3 which describe a method invocation in which a client makes a request for a remote operation to ObjectBroker's security

subsystem, the ObjectBroker security subsystem in turn invokes a GSS routine in the DCE Security library and the DCE Security Library executes the call, which sets up the security context. The Examiner cites sequence of operations 1, 2 and 3 of Parodi for teaching “a first class including methods of initiating said secured call” as recited in claim 1. However, there is no indication that these sequence of operations belong to a first class. In particular, there is no indication that the sequence of operations in Parodi belong to any kind of class. Furthermore, the mere sequence of operations do not establish a class as would be apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art.

The Examiner cites operations 9 and 10 of Parodi, which describe that the security subsystem determines that the message should be handled by the GSS implementation and passes the message there and the DCE Security layer checks the received token and if it is valid, accepts the security context, for teaching the second class of claim 1. However, again, there is no indication that these sequence of operations belong to a particular class. In particular, it appears that operations 1-3 and 9 and 10 belong to a sequence of operations including 16 total operations.

The Examiner cites paragraph 2 on page 46 of Parodi for teaching the third class of claim 1. Paragraph 2, as identified by the Examiner, describes that once a security context is established, it is used in the verification of MAC-sealed messages between the server and the client. Again, there is no indication of a third class, or that a third class includes methods for bidirectional exchange, as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, operations 1-3, 9 and 10 (first and second class as cited by the Examiner) describe the interaction of ObjectBroker and the DCE

Security Service components in the establishment of a security context (third class as cited by the Examiner). The first and second class cited by the Examiner make up the third class cited by the Examiner. Therefore, methods adapted to manage a secured call do not belong to only one of the first, second or third class.

Assuming that operations 1-3, 9, 10 and paragraph 2 teach a first, second and third class, methods adapted to manage a secured call of a programming interface would not belong to *only one of* the first, second and third class, as recited in claim 1. In particular, operations 4-8 and 11-16, which are not of the first, second and third class of Parodi designated by the Examiner, are also possible.

The Examiner states that Parodi does not teach that “said three classes are structured in a hierarchy in which said first and second classes inherit from said third class”, as further recited in claim 1, and cites Ossher to cure the deficiency.

Assuming Osssher teaches classes structured in a hierarchy, the combination of Osssher with Parodi is not obvious. There is no reason why steps 1-3 and 9 and 10 of Parodi should be arranged in a hierarchy nor is there any reason why steps 1-3 or steps 9 and 10 should inherit from the operations described in paragraph 2, as cited by the Examiner. In particular, steps 1-3 and 9 and 10 appear to be sequential. It appears that the Examiner’s reasoning is merely a result of impermissible hindsight.

For the above reasons, claim 1 and its dependent claim should be deemed patentable. Since claim 3 describes similar elements, claim 3 and its dependent claim should be deemed patentable for the same reason.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. APPLN. NO.: 09/734,650

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. Q61910

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860


WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 9, 2004

Respectfully submitted,


Ruthleen E. Uy
Registration No. 51,361